

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,222	06/01/2006	Bart Gerard Bernard Barenbrug	348162-982820	1685
94518 DLA PIPER L	7590 12/21/201 I.P.(US)	0	EXAMINER	
2000 UNIVER	SITY AVENUE		MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM	
EAST PALO	ALTO, CA 94303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/581,222	BARENBRUG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	2628	

	Examine	ALCOIN	1					
	ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	2628	ĺ					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this lication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which piaces the lication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time ods:							
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) No period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is lat no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. 								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE CF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origin than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
3. The proposed amendment(s) flide after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filling a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			ne issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13		mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		iipiiant Ameriament (101-324).					
 Applicant's Tephy has overcome are following rejection(s) In Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	□ will not be entered, or b) □ will vided below or appended.	be entered and an e	cplanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. 🛮 Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. 🔲 Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>12/06/20</u>	010						
/Andrew Wang/	/A . N.A. /							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628	/A. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 2628							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, applicant argument and the prior at Deering does not disclose: 'a restartizer configured to traverse a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image for all of the plurality of different views of said 3D image guch that traversing is performed once for said 3D image "Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Deering stated that:"...filtening engine 106 may scan through virtual screen space in raster fashion..."see Deering, Page 8, Paragraph(0110), and "...The 3D graphics data may comprise a stream of graphics primitives..."see Deering, Page 4, Paragraph(05076).

À raster fashion is a rasterization 'that is applied to a 30 image data the data could be a stream of many different view of the 30 image trought a computational pipeline to be rendered once." The rendering engine may send primitives through a computational pipeline (or partition the primitives among a number of parallel pipelines) to render the primitives in terms of samples." Deering, Page2, Paragraph(2021).

In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, applicant argues on page 7 that the prior art Deering does not discloses." a hader unit configured to determine a color of the output of the rasterizer and forward a shaded color sample along with its screen coordinates." Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Deering stated that: "(Deering, Pages 4-5, Paragraph (0.055), lines 1-13 "rendering engine... compute color information." In this case the rendering engine is the shader unit."), and (Deering, Page 3. Paragraph (0.027), lines 1-8 'the positions are in a two-dimensional field which are the screen coordinates.").

Deering discloses a rasterization that receives or forward the stream of 3d image data from a shader. For example a rasterizer gets the output of a vertex shader and a pixel shader gets the output of the rasterizer.

In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, applicant argues on page 8 that the prior art Deering does not disclose:" a plurality of screen space resamplers, each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the plurality of different views such that resampling is performed a plurality of times in parallel for said 3D image. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument because Deering stated that: "the supersamples are generated by resamplers (rendring engine and filtering engine)." (Deering, Page 4, Paragraph [037], lines 1-3 and, Page 3, Paragraph [0072], lines 1-4, and "...filtering engine 106 may scan through virtual screen space in raster fashion..."see Deering, Page 8, Paragraph[0110].

The filter endine resample the sample to det supersample.

In response to applicant's argument for claim 9, the response used for claim is the same used for claim 9.